

A characterization of holonomy invariant functions on tangent bundles

Bernadett Aradi and Dávid Cs. Kertész*

October 3, 2012

Abstract

We show that the holonomy invariance of a function on the tangent bundle of a manifold, together with very mild regularity conditions on the function, is equivalent to the existence of local parallelisms compatible with the function in a natural way. Thus, in particular, we obtain a characterization of generalized Berwald manifolds. We also construct a simple example of a generalized Berwald manifold which is not Berwald.

AMS *Subject Class.* (2010): 53B40, 53C10.

Key words: holonomy invariance, parallel translation, parallelism, G-structure, generalized Berwald manifold

Introduction

A function given on the tangent bundle of a manifold is said to be holonomy invariant if there is a covariant derivative on the manifold whose parallel translations preserve the function. The Finsler function of a generalized Berwald manifold is an example of such a function. So is, in particular, the Finsler function of a Berwald manifold, in which case the covariant derivative is torsion-free and unique.

Berwald manifolds have been studied intensely; many equivalent definitions and characterizations are known (see, e.g., [8]), and there is a nice classification of this type of Finsler manifolds due to the structure theorem of Szabó [7]. Such a classification of generalized Berwald manifolds is not yet known, nevertheless many interesting papers have been written on the subject, for example, by M. Hashiguchi and Y. Ichijyō [3], Y. Ichijyō [4, 5], Sz. Szakál and J. Szilasi [6] and L. Tamássy [10].

The present work was strongly motivated by the papers [4, 5] of Ichijyō. He proved that connected generalized Berwald manifolds are the same as the so-called $\{V, H\}$ manifolds. In this paper we generalize Ichijyō's concept of $\{V, H\}$

*The authors were supported by the TÁMOP-4.2.2/B-10/1-2010-0024 project. The project is co-financed by the European Union and the European Social Fund.

manifolds by introducing functions on the tangent manifold compatible with a covering parallelism (Definition 5). Thus we provide a possible answer for Problem 9 in [2], where Hashiguchi listed some open problems on generalized Berwald manifolds. With our new definition we reformulate and also generalize Ichijyō's theorem: instead of the strong regularity conditions on the Finsler function, we assume only continuity and that the function vanishes exactly at the zero vectors. Under such mild conditions, we prove that the function is holonomy invariant if, and only if, it is compatible with a covering parallelism on the manifold in a natural way (Theorem 7). As a corollary, by applying this result to a Finsler function, we obtain a characterization of generalized Berwald manifolds (Corollary 8).

The structure of the paper is the following. In the first section we collect our notations and basic tools. After this, we turn to give the definition of a parallelism on a manifold and establish its correspondence with trivializations of the tangent bundle. This correspondence will play an important role later. In the third section we set up and prove the main result; here the reader can find the definition mentioned in the previous paragraph, an auxiliary lemma and the theorem stating the equivalence (Theorem 7). Finally, we give a simple example of a non-Berwaldian generalized Berwald manifold.

1 Preliminaries

Throughout the present paper, by a *manifold* we shall mean a finite dimensional second countable, smooth manifold, whose underlying topological space is Hausdorff. Furthermore, we always assume that the considered manifold is connected. Given a manifold M , let $C^\infty(M)$ denote the real algebra of smooth functions on M . The *tangent bundle* of M is $\tau: TM \rightarrow M$, and $\dot{TM}$ denotes the tangent manifold with the zero tangent vectors removed.

Given an open interval I and a curve $\gamma: I \rightarrow M$, we can always reparametrize γ so that its domain contains 0. Henceforth, we will assume that any curve is parametrized in this way. We also assume the regularity of any curve mentioned in the paper.

Consider a smooth curve $\gamma: I \rightarrow M$. A vector field along γ is a smooth mapping $X: I \rightarrow TM$ such that $\tau \circ X = \gamma$. A covariant derivative ∇ on M induces a covariant derivative ∇_γ on the $C^\infty(I)$ -module of vector fields along γ , such that

$$\nabla_\gamma X(t) := \nabla_{\dot{\gamma}(t)} \tilde{X} \quad (t \in I),$$

where $\dot{\gamma}(t)$ is the velocity of γ at t , and $\tilde{X}$ is a vector field on M such that $\tilde{X} \circ \gamma = X$.

A vector field X along γ is *parallel* if it satisfies the ordinary differential equation $\nabla_\gamma X = 0$. The *parallel translation* of a tangent vector $v \in T_{\gamma(0)}M$ to $T_{\gamma(t)}M$ is $X(t)$ where X is the unique parallel vector field along γ with $X(0) = v$. Then the parallel transport from $\gamma(0)$ to $\gamma(t)$ along γ (with respect to ∇) is

$$P_\gamma^t: T_{\gamma(0)}M \rightarrow T_{\gamma(t)}M, \quad v \mapsto X(t).$$

It is a well-known result that this mapping is a linear isomorphism between the tangent spaces.

Later we write simply P_γ for P_γ^1 if I contains 1.

A *trivialization* of the tangent bundle TM on an open subset $\mathcal{U} \subset M$ (or a *local trivialization* of TM) is a smooth mapping $\varphi: \mathcal{U} \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow TM$ such that for any $p \in \mathcal{U}$ the mapping

$$\varphi_p: v \in \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto \varphi_p(v) := \varphi(p, v) \in T_p M$$

is a linear isomorphism. The set $\mathcal{U}$ is the *domain* of the trivialization φ . Sometimes we want to emphasize the domain of a trivialization, and we use the notation $(\mathcal{U}, \varphi)$ for a trivialization φ with domain $\mathcal{U}$. Given two local trivializations $(\mathcal{U}_\alpha, \varphi_\alpha)$ and $(\mathcal{U}_\beta, \varphi_\beta)$ of TM such that $\mathcal{U}_\alpha \cap \mathcal{U}_\beta \neq \emptyset$, the *transition mapping* from φ_β to φ_α is

$$\varphi_{\beta\alpha}: \mathcal{U}_\alpha \cap \mathcal{U}_\beta \rightarrow \text{GL}(\mathbb{R}^n), \quad \varphi_{\beta\alpha}(p) := (\varphi_\alpha)_p^{-1} \circ (\varphi_\beta)_p.$$

A family of local trivializations $(\mathcal{U}_\alpha, \varphi_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}}$ is called a *covering trivialization* of TM , if

$$M = \bigcup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} \mathcal{U}_\alpha.$$

Let G be a subgroup of $\text{GL}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. A covering trivialization $(\mathcal{U}_\alpha, \varphi_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}}$ of TM is a *G-structure* on TM if for any $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{A}$ the transition mapping $\varphi_{\beta\alpha}$ is G -valued.

A G -structure on the tangent bundle TM of a manifold M induces a covariant derivative on M if G is a Lie group. A precise formulation of this result goes as follows.

Lemma 1. *Let M be an n -dimensional manifold, G a Lie subgroup of $\text{GL}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $(\mathcal{U}_\alpha, \varphi_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}}$ a G -structure on TM . Then there exists a covariant derivative ∇ on M such that if a smooth curve $\gamma: I \rightarrow M$ takes values only in a single $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$, then there is a smooth curve $A: I \rightarrow G$ such that the parallel transport along γ is of the form*

$$P_\gamma^t = (\varphi_\alpha)_{\gamma(t)} \circ A(t) \circ (\varphi_\alpha)_{\gamma(0)}^{-1}, \quad t \in I.$$

Displayed by a commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{R}^n & \xrightarrow{(\varphi_\alpha)_{\gamma(0)}} & T_{\gamma(0)} M \\ A(t) \downarrow & & \downarrow P_\gamma^t \\ \mathbb{R}^n & \xrightarrow{(\varphi_\alpha)_{\gamma(t)}} & T_{\gamma(t)} M \end{array}.$$

For a proof, see, e.g., [11, Chapter 3].

2 Parallelisms

Let $\mathcal{P}_{(p,q)} := \text{Hom}(T_p M, T_q M)$ for any pair of points $(p, q) \in M \times M$, and let $\mathcal{P}$ be the disjoint union of these sets. Then

$$\pi: \mathcal{P} \rightarrow M \times M, \quad \pi(\mathcal{P}_{(p,q)}) = (p, q)$$

is a vector bundle over $M \times M$. By a *parallelism* on M we mean a smooth section P of this vector bundle satisfying

$$P(r, q) \circ P(p, r) = P(p, q) \quad \text{and} \quad P(p, p) = 1_{T_p M}$$

for all $p, q, r \in M$ (cf. [1, p. 174]). These conditions imply that the mappings

$$P(p, q): T_p M \rightarrow T_q M, \quad (p, q) \in M \times M$$

are actually bijective.

Most manifolds do not admit a parallelism. Exactly those manifolds enjoy this nice property, which can be endowed with a global frame field. These manifolds are said to be *parallelizable*. However, any point in a manifold has an open neighbourhood, which is, as an open submanifold, parallelizable. Sometimes for a parallelism P on an open submanifold $\mathcal{U}$ we use the notation $(\mathcal{U}, P)$.

By a *covering parallelism* of a manifold M we mean a family of parallelizable submanifolds $(\mathcal{U}_\alpha, P_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}}$ of M , where $(\mathcal{U}_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}}$ is an open covering of M .

There is a natural correspondence between parallelisms on open submanifolds of a manifold and local trivializations of its tangent bundle. In order to make this correspondence precise, we define an equivalence relation on the set of all trivializations on an open subset $\mathcal{U}$ of a manifold M . We say that *two trivializations* $(\mathcal{U}, \varphi)$ and $(\mathcal{U}, \psi)$ of TM are in the same equivalence class if there is a linear automorphism $A \in \text{GL}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that

$$\varphi(p, v) = \psi(p, A(v)) \quad \text{for all } p \in \mathcal{U}, v \in \mathbb{R}^n \quad (n := \dim M).$$

Equivalently, the transition mapping from φ to ψ takes the same value $A \in \text{GL}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ at every point $p \in \mathcal{U}$. We call the class of φ *the class of linear perturbations of φ* , and denote it by $[\varphi]$.

Lemma 2. *Given a local trivialization $(\mathcal{U}, \varphi)$ of the tangent bundle of a manifold, the mapping $P: \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$ given by*

$$P(p, q) := \varphi_q \circ \varphi_p^{-1}, \quad p, q \in \mathcal{U} \tag{1}$$

is a parallelism on $\mathcal{U}$. Furthermore, the mapping $[\varphi] \mapsto P$, where P is given by (1), is a bijection between the classes of linear perturbations of trivializations on $\mathcal{U}$ and the parallelisms on $\mathcal{U}$.

Proof. For a trivialization φ on $\mathcal{U}$, let P be given by (1). It is easy to show that P is a parallelism on $\mathcal{U}$ and that any other trivialization in $[\varphi]$ induces the same parallelism.

We construct a bijective left inverse Φ for the mapping $[\varphi] \mapsto P$.

Suppose that P is a parallelism on $\mathcal{U} \subset M$. Fix a point $p \in \mathcal{U}$ and a linear isomorphism $\eta_p: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow T_p M$. Let $\Phi(P) := [\varphi]$, where φ is a trivialization of TM on $\mathcal{U}$ given by

$$\varphi: (q, v) \in \mathcal{U} \times \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto \varphi(q, v) := P(p, q) \circ \eta_p(v). \quad (2)$$

One can easily check that φ is indeed a trivialization on $\mathcal{U}$. Now we show that $\Phi(P)$ does not depend on the choice of p and η_p . If $\bar{p}$ is another point in $\mathcal{U}$ and $\mu_{\bar{p}}: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow T_{\bar{p}} M$ is a linear isomorphism, then for an arbitrary $q \in \mathcal{U}$ and $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we have

$$\bar{\varphi}(q, v) := P(\bar{p}, q) \circ \mu_{\bar{p}}(v) = P(p, q) \circ P(\bar{p}, p) \circ \mu_{\bar{p}}(v). \quad (3)$$

Then there exists a unique $A \in \text{GL}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that

$$P(\bar{p}, p) \circ \mu_{\bar{p}} = \eta_p \circ A,$$

therefore (3) takes the form

$$\bar{\varphi}(q, v) = P(p, q) \circ \eta_p(A(v)) = \varphi(q, A(v)),$$

and hence $\bar{\varphi}$ is in the class $[\varphi]$.

It remains to show that the assignment $\Phi: P \mapsto \Phi(P)$ is bijective. For a trivialization φ on $\mathcal{U}$, let a parallelism P on $\mathcal{U}$ be given by (1). We verify that $\Phi(P) = [\varphi]$. Indeed, if we apply (2) with the choice $\eta_p := \varphi_p$, we have

$$P(p, q) \circ \varphi_p(v) \stackrel{(1)}{=} \varphi_q \circ \varphi_p^{-1} \circ \varphi_p(v) = \varphi_q(v) = \varphi(q, v),$$

thus Φ is surjective. Furthermore, for a given $[\varphi]$ relation (1) uniquely determines P , hence Φ is also injective. Thus the mapping $[\varphi] \mapsto P$ is invertible, as was to be shown. $\square$

Remark 3. Let P be a parallelism on an open subset $\mathcal{U}$ of a manifold. It turns out from the proof of the previous lemma that for any point p in $\mathcal{U}$ and linear isomorphism $\eta_p: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow T_p M$, there is a unique trivialization $(\mathcal{U}, \varphi)$ in the perturbation class corresponding to P such that $\varphi_p = \eta_p$.

3 Holonomy invariant functions on TM

Let M be a manifold and consider a function F on the tangent manifold. Hereafter, we use the notation F_p for the restriction of F to a tangent space $T_p M$, $p \in M$.

In this section we are going to study the ‘compatibility’ of the function F with a covariant derivative and a parallelism. ‘Compatibility’ means here that the

linear isomorphisms (between the tangent spaces) induced by the investigated additional structure on the manifold leaves the considered function invariant. For example, given a Finsler manifold (M, F) and a covariant derivative ∇ on M we can study whether the induced parallel translation preserves the Finsler norms of tangent vectors. If the answer is positive along all curves, then we say that the Finsler function is *holonomy invariant* with respect to ∇ . The precise definition for an arbitrary function on TM reads as follows.

Definition 4. Let ∇ be a covariant derivative on a manifold M and F a function on TM . We say that the function F is *holonomy invariant with respect to ∇* if the parallel transport P_γ induced by ∇ preserves F , that is, for any curve $\gamma: I \rightarrow M$ and parameter $t \in I$ we have

$$F_{\gamma(t)} \circ P_\gamma^t = F_{\gamma(0)}.$$

Similarly, one can define the compatibility of a function on TM and a parallelism.

Definition 5. We say that a function F on TM is *compatible with the parallelism P* on M if F takes the same value on parallel vectors, that is, for any $p, q \in M$ the relation

$$F_q \circ P(p, q) = F_p$$

holds. More generally, F is *compatible with a covering parallelism $(\mathcal{U}_\alpha, P_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}}$* if the restriction of the function F to $\tau^{-1}(\mathcal{U}_\alpha)$ is compatible with the parallelism $(\mathcal{U}_\alpha, P_\alpha)$ for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$.

For a very general class of functions a nice relation holds between the two properties just introduced. However, to prove Theorem 7, that describes this relation, we need the following lemma; this is a mild generalization of one of Ichijyō's results [4].

Lemma 6. *Let $f: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous function such that it vanishes at 0, and only there. Then the isometry group*

$$\text{iso}(f) := \{A \in \text{End}(\mathbb{R}^n) \mid f \circ A = f\}$$

of f is a Lie subgroup of $\text{GL}(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

Proof. Notice first that the elements of $\text{iso}(f)$ are invertible. For an $A \in \text{iso}(f)$ and a vector $v \neq 0$ of $\mathbb{R}^n$ we have

$$f \circ A(v) = f(v) \neq 0,$$

thus $A(v) = 0$ is impossible, due to the condition on f . It follows that $\text{iso}(f) \subset \text{GL}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and also that $\text{iso}(f)$ is a subgroup of $\text{GL}(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

It remains to show that the subgroup $\text{iso}(f)$ is closed, then Cartan's closed subgroup theorem implies that $\text{iso}(f)$ is indeed a Lie group. Now let us consider

a sequence (A_k) in $\text{iso}(f)$ and assume that it converges to $A \in \text{End}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Then, taking into account the continuity of f , we obtain

$$f(A(v)) = f\left(\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} A_k(v)\right) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} f(A_k(v)) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} f(v) = f(v)$$

for any $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$, proving that $A \in \text{iso}(f)$ and thus the closedness of $\text{iso}(f)$. $\square$

Now we have all the tools to prove the following result.

Theorem 7. *Let $F: TM \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function such that it is*

- (i) *zero on the zero vectors of TM and non-vanishing on $\mathring{TM}$,*
- (ii) *continuous over TM .*

Then F is holonomy invariant with respect to some covariant derivative on the manifold if, and only if, it is compatible with a covering parallelism.

Proof. Consider a function $F: TM \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying the two conditions of the theorem. Recall that M is assumed to be connected.

(1) Let ∇ be a covariant derivative on M and assume that the function F is holonomy invariant with respect to ∇ . Fix a point $p \in M$ and a chart $(\mathcal{U}, u)$ around p such that $u(\mathcal{U})$ is convex in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Now we construct a parallelism on $\mathcal{U}$. For an arbitrary point $q \in \mathcal{U}$ consider the curve $c_q(t) := (1-t)u(p) + tu(q)$, which is the line segment in $\mathbb{R}^n$ connecting $u(p)$ and $u(q)$. In this case $\gamma_q := u^{-1} \circ c_q$ is a curve in $\mathcal{U}$ connecting p with q . Now let

$$P(p, q) := P_{\gamma_q},$$

where P_{γ_q} is the parallel transport along γ_q with respect to ∇ . For any $q_1, q_2 \in \mathcal{U}$ define $P(q_1, q_2)$ as

$$P(q_1, q_2) := P(p, q_2) \circ P(p, q_1)^{-1}.$$

It can be easily checked that P is a parallelism over $\mathcal{U}$; the smoothness follows from the smooth dependence on parameters of ODE solutions. It is also clear by the holonomy invariance that for $q, r \in \mathcal{U}$ we have

$$F_r \circ P(q, r) = F_r \circ P_{\gamma_r} \circ P_{\gamma_q}^{-1} = F_p \circ P_{\gamma_q}^{-1} = F_q,$$

which means that F is indeed compatible with P .

To obtain a covering parallelism of M , we can apply the same method for sufficiently many $p \in M$.

(2) In this part we assume that F is compatible with a covering parallelism $(\mathcal{U}_\alpha, P_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}}$ of M .

First fix an element of the covering parallelism; let it be $(\mathcal{U}, P)$ for simplicity. Let $(\mathcal{U}, \varphi)$ denote a trivialization corresponding to P (see Lemma 2) and consider the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathbb{R}^n & \xrightarrow{\varphi_p} & T_p M & \xrightarrow{F_p} & \mathbb{R} \\ 1_{\mathbb{R}^n} \downarrow & & \downarrow P(p, q) & & \downarrow 1_{\mathbb{R}} \\ \mathbb{R}^n & \xrightarrow{\varphi_q} & T_q M & \xrightarrow{F_q} & \mathbb{R} \end{array}$$

for some $p, q \in \mathcal{U}$. The left part of the diagram commutes due to (1), and the right part does because of the compatibility of F and P . Hence the entire diagram is commutative and we have

$$F_p \circ \varphi_p = F_q \circ \varphi_q.$$

It means that the function above is independent of the chosen point of $\mathcal{U}$, thus it is possible to use the notation $F \circ \varphi := F_p \circ \varphi_p$. Then the function

$$F \circ \varphi: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

is a continuous function on $\mathbb{R}^n$ and it is zero only at 0. It follows by Lemma 6, that

$$\text{the isometry group of } F \circ \varphi \text{ is a Lie subgroup of } \text{GL}(\mathbb{R}^n). \quad (4)$$

As our manifold M is second countable, we can assume that the index set $\mathcal{A}$ of the covering $(\mathcal{U}_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}}$ is the set of natural numbers $\mathbb{N}$, thus we can continue to work with a compatible covering parallelism $(\mathcal{U}_i, P_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$. Consider $(\mathcal{U}_0, P_0)$ and an induced trivialization $(\mathcal{U}_0, \varphi_0)$; let $f := F \circ \varphi_0$ with the notation introduced in the previous paragraph. Since M is connected, there exists an index $j \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathcal{U}_j \cap \mathcal{U}_0 \neq \emptyset$; after a rearrangement of the indices we can assume that $j = 1$. Let $p \in \mathcal{U}_0 \cap \mathcal{U}_1$ and let φ_1 be the trivialization over $\mathcal{U}_1$ induced by P_1 such that

$$(\varphi_1)_p = (\varphi_0)_p;$$

i.e., φ_1 is the unique element of the perturbation class corresponding to P_1 with this initial condition (cf. Remark 3). In this case we have

$$F \circ \varphi_1 = F_p \circ (\varphi_1)_p = F_p \circ (\varphi_0)_p = F \circ \varphi_0 = f.$$

We can repeat the method to obtain a local trivialization $(\mathcal{U}_2, \varphi_2)$ in the next step such that $f = F \circ \varphi_2$, then use induction for the greater indices. Every element of the covering $(\mathcal{U}_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ that we started from occurs at some point of this process. Otherwise M could be partitioned into two nonempty open subsets: the union of those sets $\mathcal{U}_i$ which occur and of those which not. However, by the connectedness of M this is impossible.

Finally, we obtain a covering trivialization $(\mathcal{U}_i, \varphi_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ and a function f on $\mathbb{R}^n$ such that

$$f = F \circ \varphi_i \text{ for all } i \in \mathbb{N}.$$

We show that this covering trivialization forms an $\text{iso}(f)$ -structure. Let $k, l \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathcal{U}_{kl} := \mathcal{U}_k \cap \mathcal{U}_l \neq \emptyset$ and $p \in \mathcal{U}_{kl}$. Then the transition mapping $\varphi_{kl}(p)$ is an element of $\text{iso}(f)$ because

$$f \circ \varphi_{kl}(p) = F_p \circ (\varphi_l)_p \circ (\varphi_l)_p^{-1} \circ (\varphi_k)_p = F_p \circ (\varphi_k)_p = f.$$

So we can conclude that $(\mathcal{U}_i, \varphi_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is an $\text{iso}(f)$ -structure.

Since $\text{iso}(f)$ is a Lie group (see (4)), the $\text{iso}(f)$ -structure $(\mathcal{U}_i, \varphi_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ induces a covariant derivative ∇ by Lemma 1. Now we prove that the function F is

holonomy invariant with respect to this covariant derivative. Let $p, q \in M$, and let $\gamma: I \rightarrow M$ be a curve connecting these two points. If F is invariant under the parallel transport along pieces of γ then it is invariant along the entire curve. Thus, we can assume that $\text{Im}(\gamma)$ is contained in a single $\mathcal{U}_k$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Lemma 1 assures that there exists a curve $A: I \rightarrow \text{iso}(f)$ such that

$$P_\gamma^t = (\varphi_k)_{\gamma(t)} \circ A(t) \circ (\varphi_k)_{\gamma(0)}^{-1}.$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\gamma(t)} \circ P_\gamma^t &= F_{\gamma(t)} \circ (\varphi_k)_{\gamma(t)} \circ A(t) \circ (\varphi_k)_{\gamma(0)}^{-1} \\ &= f \circ A(t) \circ (\varphi_k)_{\gamma(0)}^{-1} \\ &= f \circ (\varphi_k)_{\gamma(0)}^{-1} \\ &= F_{\gamma(0)}, \end{aligned}$$

which means that the function F is invariant under the parallel translations determined by ∇ ; hence it is holonomy invariant with respect to this covariant derivative, as it was stated. $\square$

Notice that, in particular, for a Finsler manifold (M, F) the concept of F being holonomy invariant with respect to a covariant derivative ∇ is equivalent to (M, F) being a generalized Berwald manifold (see [6]). Thus, by the previous theorem we obtain the following characterization of generalized Berwald manifolds with the help of parallelisms.

Corollary 8. *A Finsler manifold is a generalized Berwald manifold if, and only if, the Finsler function is compatible with a covering parallelism.*

Remark 9. All our results remain true in a more general setting. Let $\pi: E \rightarrow M$ be an arbitrary vector bundle of rank m , and $F: E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ a function such that it is

- (i) zero exactly at the zero vectors of E ,
- (ii) continuous over E .

In this case it makes sense to define the compatibility of F with a covariant derivative on the vector bundle and with a covering parallelism (analogously to the case when the vector bundle is $\tau: TM \rightarrow M$), and a direct generalization of our argument above can be carried out in this setting as well.

4 An example of a proper generalized Berwald manifold

In this section we present a simple example of a generalized Berwald manifold, which is not of Berwald type. The idea is to define a Finsler function on a manifold which is holonomy invariant with respect to a unique covariant derivative, and to show that this particular covariant derivative has non-vanishing torsion.

Our example will be a two-dimensional Randers manifold. We are going to define the covariant derivative with the help of a global parallelism, and heavily use that there is a natural correspondence between the set of global parallelisms and 2-frames on the manifold.

(1) *Construction of the Randers manifold and a compatible parallelism.* Let us consider the two-dimensional manifold $\mathbb{R}^2$ and its standard global chart $(\mathbb{R}^2, (x, y))$. Define a 2-frame on $\mathbb{R}^2$ by

$$E_1 := x \frac{\partial}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial}{\partial y}, \quad E_2 := -\frac{\partial}{\partial x},$$

and let

$$E^1 := dy, \quad E^2 := -dx + x dy$$

be its dual frame. Consider the Minkowski norm $f := \sqrt{4x^2 + 12y^2} - x$ on $\mathbb{R}^2$. Then

$$F := f \circ (E^1, E^2) = \sqrt{4(dy)^2 + 12(-dx + x dy)^2} - dy.$$

is a Finsler function for $\mathbb{R}^2$ of Randers type.

The frame field (E_1, E_2) induces a trivialization

$$\varphi: (p, v) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2 \mapsto v^1 E_1(p) + v^2 E_2(p) \in T\mathbb{R}^2$$

of the tangent manifold. Let P be the global parallelism determined by φ according to Lemma 2. Then, for any $p, q \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and $v \in T_p\mathbb{R}^2$, the parallel transport $P(p, q)$ is given by

$$P(p, q)(v) \stackrel{(1)}{=} \varphi_q \circ \varphi_p^{-1}(v) = E^1(v)E_1(q) + E^2(v)E_2(q).$$

The Finsler function F is compatible with P . Indeed, if $w := P(p, q)(v)$, then $E^1(w) = E^1(v)$ and $E^2(w) = E^2(v)$, hence $F(w) = F(v)$.

(2) *Construction of a suitable covariant derivative.* Let ∇ be the covariant derivative on $\mathbb{R}^2$ characterized by

$$\nabla E_1 = \nabla E_2 = 0.$$

Then for any $p \in \mathbb{R}^2$, $v \in T_p\mathbb{R}^2$ the mapping

$$X_v: q \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mapsto X_v(q) := P(p, q)(v) := E^1(v)E_1(q) + E^2(v)E_2(q) \in T_q\mathbb{R}^2$$

is a vector field on the plane satisfying $\nabla X_v = 0$. Hence, the parallel transport along a curve $\gamma: I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ acts by

$$P_\gamma^t(v) = X_v(\gamma(t)) = P(\gamma(0), \gamma(t))(v) \quad \text{for } v \in T_{\gamma(0)}\mathbb{R}^2.$$

Since F is compatible with the parallelism P , it follows that F is holonomy invariant with respect to ∇ . Therefore $(\mathbb{R}^2, F)$ is a generalized Berwald manifold.

(3) *There is no other covariant derivative satisfying the requirement of holonomy invariance.* Notice first that the isometry group of F_p has only two elements for any $p \in \mathbb{R}^2$. More precisely, in the basis $(E_1(p), E_2(p))$, the elements of $\text{iso}(F_p)$ are represented by the matrices

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Indeed, if we assume that a linear mapping $A: \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ is an isometry of the Finsler norm $f := \sqrt{4x^2 + 12y^2} - x$, then the four conditions that f preserves the norms of the vectors $(1, 0)$, $(-1, 0)$, $(0, 1)$ and $(0, -1)$ imply that A is either the identity or the reflection about the axis $y = 0$.

Now suppose that F is holonomy invariant with respect to another covariant derivative $\bar{\nabla}$, and let $\gamma: I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ be a smooth curve. Then for the parallel transport $\bar{P}_\gamma^t$ we have

$$(\bar{P}_\gamma^t)^{-1} \circ P_\gamma^t \in \text{iso}(F_{\gamma(0)}).$$

The parallel translation is smooth, hence the linear isomorphism $(\bar{P}_\gamma^t)^{-1} \circ P_\gamma^t$ depends continuously on t . Since $(\bar{P}_\gamma^0)^{-1} \circ P_\gamma^0 = 1_{T_{\gamma(0)}\mathbb{R}^2}$, it follows that $P_\gamma^t = \bar{P}_\gamma^t$ for all $t \in I$. Then $\nabla = \bar{\nabla}$, because a covariant derivative is determined by its induced parallel translations (see, e.g., [9, Chapter 5]).

(4) *The covariant derivative ∇ has non-vanishing torsion.* Since

$$\mathsf{T}^\nabla(E_1, E_2) = \nabla_{E_1} E_2 - \nabla_{E_2} E_1 - [E_1, E_2] = -\frac{\partial}{\partial x},$$

we have that $(\mathbb{R}^2, F)$ is not a Berwald manifold.

Acknowledgements

We wish to express our gratitude to our supervisor, József Szilasi for encouraging us to write this paper and for his guidance throughout the work. We are thankful also to Rezső Lovas for his valuable suggestions.

References

- [1] W. GREUB, S. HALPERIN, AND R. VANSTONE, *Connections, Curvature and Cohomology*, vol. 1, Academic Press, New York and London, 1972.
- [2] M. HASHIGUCHI, *Some problems on generalized Berwald spaces*, Rep. Fac. Sci., Kagoshima Univ., (Math., Phys., & Chem.), **16** (1983), 59–63.
- [3] M. HASHIGUCHI AND Y. ICHIJYŌ, *On generalized Berwald spaces*, Rep. Fac. Sci. Kagoshima Univ., (Math., Phys. & Chem.), **15** (1982), 19–32.
- [4] Y. ICHIJYŌ, *Finsler manifolds modeled on Minkowski spaces*, J. Math. Kyoto Univ., **16** (1976), 639–652.

- [5] Y. ICHIJYŌ, *Finsler manifolds with a linear connection*, J. Math. Tokushima Univ., **10** (1976), 1–11.
- [6] SZ. SZAKÁL AND J. SZILASI, *A new approach to generalized Berwald manifolds I*, SUT J. Math., **37** (2001), 19–41.
- [7] Z. I. SZABÓ, *Positive definite Berwald spaces (Structure theorems on Berwald spaces)*, Tensor N.S., **35** (1981), 25–39.
- [8] J. SZILASI, R. L. LOVAS, AND D. CS. KERTÉSZ, *Several ways to a Berwald manifold – and some steps beyond*, Extracta Mathematicae, **26** (2011), 89–130.
- [9] J. SZILASI, R. L. LOVAS, AND D. CS. KERTÉSZ, *Connections, Sprays and Finsler Structures*, to appear at World Scientific, 2013.
- [10] L. TAMÁSSY, *Point Finsler spaces with metrical linear connections*, Publ. Math. Debrecen, **56** (2000), 643–655.
- [11] C. WENDL, *Lecture Notes on Bundles and Connections*.
<http://www.homepages.ucl.ac.uk/~ucahcwe/connections.html>, 2008.

Bernadett Aradi

*University of Debrecen, Institute of Mathematics,
H-4010 Debrecen, P.O. Box 12, Hungary*
E-mail: bernadett.aradi@science.unideb.hu

Dávid Csaba Kertész

*University of Debrecen, Institute of Mathematics,
H-4010 Debrecen, P.O. Box 12, Hungary*
E-mail: kerteszd@science.unideb.hu